



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

friends of the Classics. Let us do what we can to make others feel these considerations, setting before ourselves the ambition of enlarging our membership in the year just opening to 750 at least.

The programme seemed to me (though perhaps I am prejudiced) a good one. An attempt had deliberately been made to keep the pedagogical side of our interests, for this meeting at least, in the background; variety has its charms. Yet the pedagogical was not neglected. Greek had a fair place. Matters definitely literary, as well as matters of pure research and text-criticism, also found room. All of the papers had interest for some of the audiences, and some of the papers interest for all. At the risk of seeming to make invidious distinctions I remark that we were singularly fortunate in the admirable address delivered by Dr. Edward Robinson on Classical Art in the Metropolitan Museum, explaining in detail the aims and purposes of the Trustees of the Museum and of those more directly in charge, and setting forth what progress has been made toward the realization of these aims.

It may be noted here that the Association has a comfortable balance in its treasury, that the subscription list proper to *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* (i. e. subscriptions by non-members) is steadily growing, and that the third volume of the paper can readily be paid for in full. The Association also owns, in connection with the paper, property which cost nearly one hundred and fifty dollars.

Resolutions were adopted extending the hearty thanks of the Association to the authorities of The College of the City of New York, for the courtesies shown, and to those who had contributed by their papers to the success of the meeting. Dr. James J. Robinson, of the Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn., was present as delegate from The Classical Association of New England; Professor J. E. Harry, of the University of Cincinnati, represented the Classical Association of the Middle West and South.

The following officers were elected: President, J. B. Hench, Shadyside Academy, Pittsburgh; Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College; Vice-Presidents, P. O. Place, Syracuse University, William F. Tibbetts, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, William F. Little, Elizabeth, B. W. Mitchell, Philadelphia, R. B. English, Washington, Pa., Mary Harwood, Girls Latin School, Baltimore, Thomas W. Sidwell, Washington, D. C.; Editors of *The Classical Weekly*, Gonzales Lodge, Charles Knapp, Ernst Riess, Harry L. Wilson.

LATIN IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS. IV

THE FOURTH YEAR

(See pages 140-142, 154-156, 210-212.)

In one respect the fourth year in our school differs materially from the work of the ordinary preparatory school. As stated in my third article,

the requirements of city and state are satisfied with three years' work in a foreign language. Hence, many of our students discontinue the study of Latin after completing the Cicero. Of about 120 students at the end of the third year not more than 60 take up the Aeneid. In part these are boys who intend to go to college, in part students who continue the study of Latin because they have become interested in the language. In either case the survivors from the first three years are to a certain extent the exceptional students. The advantage accruing from this fact is all the less to be despised, because more than ever we feel during this year that the course is overloaded. In the first place, the time at our disposal is now cut down from five to four periods a week. In the second place, with all the care employed in advising students during our stay with us, there are always numerous odds and ends of required work to be made up, so that most of our seniors carry a very heavy program. The problem is furthermore complicated during the second half of the year by the fact that students admitted in February and intending to enter college in September are anxious to 'double up' in certain subjects, in order to complete their course in three and a half years. This is done chiefly in English, American History and Latin. In both the former subjects, I suppose, the difficulty is felt less, on account of the non-continuous character of the work. But we feel it very keenly, for the exigencies of the program in a large institution do not allow us to do the natural thing, namely to put these boys through an eight period course. That would be an easy solution, and would have the additional advantage that a very large amount of the reading would have to be at sight, or with the preparation done in class. As it is, however, these unfortunates must from the outset follow the work not only of the class beginning Vergil, but also that of the second half. In their case, I am afraid, the work is very largely of the cramming character, and is assisted—very excusably—by the 'translation'.

Hurry, then, is more than ever our watchword during the fourth year. This is all the more unfortunate, as we honestly would like to make the study of Vergil what it deserves to be, the crowning glory of the course. We try to go slowly at the beginning, in order to give a firm grounding, but we have to increase the work during the last half year very much, and at present, for example, I am trying to work each period through at least fifty verses. While the boys stand up fairly well under the strain, as teacher I am but very little satisfied with the result. In addition to the great amount of reading matter, we must not overlook a supplementary drill in composition work. Under the syllabus, this is now cut down to the equivalent of one recitation every two weeks; but, even so, my feeling

is that I can ill afford to spare the time, much as I am convinced of the necessity for doing it.

This, then, is the *stirps semenque malorum omnium*. The requirements of the Syllabus sound very well: we are supposed to train the student in idiomatic translation, which shall do justice to the beauty of the original, make him understand the metrical form, give him an insight into the historical background and into the intention of the poet, teach him the geography, mythology and antiquities necessary for a proper understanding, and, last, but not least, make him understand the stylistic and grammatical differences between prose and poetry.

In the first place, there exists a fundamental difference of opinion among teachers as to what constitutes a proper translation of the poet. It is only necessary to glance at the translations offered in the notes to the various school editions to appreciate this divergence. If I may be allowed to express a frank criticism of all of them, I do not believe in the great liberties taken with the words. As I conceive of the task of translating a poet, the chief duty of the translator is to preserve the characteristics of the poetic style. Now, two things stand out preëminently: poetry is concrete and is special. Words are poetic because they appeal direct to the senses, and the poet speaks in images, even where he does not use the form of the metaphor or the comparison. In the work with our pupils, I think, we should try to bring out these two features, not only on account of scholarly exactness, but also because of the valuable insight thus gained by the student into the character of genuine poetry. In this respect, it seems to me, the notes of our editions sin a great deal. Now, the faithful expression of these two features is not compatible with the elegance which many teachers seek to achieve. It is true that Vergil is one of the *docti poetae*, but he is a great poet withal, and apart from occasional rhetorical lapses, a man of finest feeling for the epic tone. This, I believe, should be brought out, even if occasionally the elegance of the translation should suffer, or the common English word order should have to be sacrificed. In this the translation of Vergil makes even higher demands on the critical appreciation of the teacher than the orations of Cicero.

In connection with this topic, it ought to be said that a proper valuation of the poet is impossible, or, at least, only imperfectly attainable to that student who knows no Greek. Again and again experience has shown me the great advantage possessed by the student who is reading Homer over his classmate who is not. The great difference between the natural and the artificial epic, which is so clearly represented by the two poets, cannot be properly felt except by him who knows both. And it is a great pity that increasingly the knowledge of Greek

is becoming scarce even among the teachers of Vergil. To a certain extent, perhaps, a thorough familiarity with Milton might be made to do duty instead, but this, too, I find lacking among our students.

As far as metrical insight goes, I am frank to say that we make a sorry showing. Mostly this may be ascribed to lack of time, for we cannot devote to reading aloud more than a minute fraction of any period. We try to make up for it by reading to our students the most beautiful passages, but, even at the best, that is but a poor substitute for the enjoyment which the student would derive from his own activity. The blame cannot be laid to defective instruction in the rules of metrical composition, for almost every one of our students is able to write out, without any mistakes, the scansion of any line which does not contain any glaring peculiarity. It is very unfortunate that our system of written examinations tends to emphasize the importance of such scansion. Should the *aurea aetas* ever come when an oral examination shall form part of the test of fitness for College, I should strenuously advocate that scansion be entirely abolished and a reading test take its place.

The requirements in regard to the subject-matter, including the 'Realia', are at present too hazy and too indefinite. No teacher is able, from either the syllabi or the examination papers, to say what is of sufficient importance to be taught and what should be omitted. In consequence we try to teach by far too much, and achieve that serio-comic mistiness which locates the Ionian Sea west of Asia Minor, makes Cymothoe the wife of Neptune, or speaks of Diomed as the son of Tydides.

With the present trend of teaching in our schools, our best results are obtained in grammar. Our boys easily—and why not?—learn the few differences in use of cases and modes and label correctly the poetic constructions. They do not badly, either, in stylistic discernment, guffaw, as they may, at the strange Greek names given to the figures of speech, which we compel them to learn because they occur in examination questions. Yet, it would be infinitely better could they instantly give parallels from their native literature, a demand which some of us make on them, even though that is not prescribed.

On the whole, I think, judging from the preparatory standpoint, our students leave us not poorly prepared. Still, I dare say, there is not one among us who does not dismiss his pupils at the end of the year with the feeling that they have missed the best which they could have gotten out of their study, namely, they have not acquired a love for poetry which would make them wish to take up a book of poems after they have left us.

The pressure has been too great, and what should be of paramount importance in the study of Vergil, the opportunity of stopping to take a look around

and appreciate the poet as the "maestro di color che sanno", has been sadly absent. Only a diminution of the quantitative requirement, together with a considerable increase in the quality of the work, can bring the relief which is absolutely needed, if the study of Vergil shall become, as it surely deserves, the heartfelt desire for the development of the aesthetic sense.

ERNST RIESS.

REVIEW

What have the Greeks done for modern Civilization? The Lowell Lectures of 1908-1909. By John Pentland Mahaffy. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons (1909). \$2.50. Pp. xi + 263.

In a series of eight lectures Professor Mahaffy selects and emphasizes various lines of achievement in which Greek preëminence has been notably reflected in modern times. By the study of a long lifetime and by a rich experience in human affairs, he is peculiarly fitted to speak authoritatively on the relations subsisting between the exponents of that ancient culture and the civilized people of to-day. His polished style and interesting treatment are calculated to appeal to a wide range of hearers and readers, and though the "attempt to cover the whole field of Greek influence" (p. v) could be realized only by handling many subjects in a sketchy manner, the purpose of the lectures prohibited the omission of any department of Greek activity.

The tone of the book, as would surely be anticipated by one acquainted with the author or his previous works, is strongly phil-hellenic. It gives, in popular form and brief compass, the results of continued reflection on hellenic achievement. How admirable the enthusiasm which then can record (p. 246) as "the highest earthly satisfaction the carrying of the torch of Greek fire alight through a long life, the highest earthly hope the passing of the torch to others to keep aflame".

The first lecture is introductory in that it discusses the causes of Greek preëminence, and indicates the branches of activity in which the Greeks excelled. The greatness of Greece was not due primarily to geographical position or climatic conditions; Greece was simply a genius among nations, more richly endowed than her neighbors, and as such her productions and achievements must be studied directly and not through Roman interpretation or English translation. Continuing, the author suggests in outline the history of Greek influence in the past, on Rome, on the later Byzantine Empire, and on the Renaissance, which became a new birth through the resurrection of Greek masterpieces. The chapter is thus a strong, direct plea in behalf of Greek studies, though the entire work argues indirectly to the same end.

After thus, by way of introduction, emphasizing the importance of the Greeks, Professor Mahaffy considers in succeeding lectures the various departments in which Greek genius has expressed itself and has exerted influence on modern civilization, such as poetry, prose, architecture and sculpture, painting and music, science, politics, philosophy, which are the captions of the respective chapters.

It is no new thing to trace the debt of English literature to Greek masters. From Shakespeare to Swinburne no English author has escaped the searching eye of classical commentator or essayist, but the subject is one of perennial interest as it furnishes strong arguments for the maintenance of Greek studies. So our author traverses the familiar spheres of Greek poetry and prose, spheres notably familiar to the facile writer of several charming volumes on Greek literature, more or less familiar to all educated people, not excepting a Boston audience; still the eclecticism of illustration is so well controlled that we hurry from epic through dramatic to lyric poetry with unflagging interest.

Similarly, in the chapter on art, well-known facts with reference to architecture and sculpture are presented in an attractive way that is likely to encourage the desire for further knowledge in the minds of uninitiated readers. The brief treatment of Greek painting (126-133) is not entirely satisfactory. Much more information can be gleaned from the many painted reliefs, vase-paintings, and Pompeian frescoes than the author here admits. In fact about the time when these lectures were delivered, there appeared an article in the *Ephe-meris Archaïologike* (1908 by Dr. Arvanitopoulos, who, on the basis of hundreds of painted stelai found at Pegasae, has evolved elaborate and interesting theories on Greek painting. Moreover, so far from the fact that red, blue, white and yellow were the colors generally used (130), Dr. Lermann has proved by chemical analysis that green was common on early sculptures in Athens, and violet in different shades has been found on many monuments, and is particularly mentioned by Greek writers. Nor is it accurate to deny the production of easel pictures to the bloom of Greek art (133), when it is generally agreed that the paintings in the Pinakothek on the Acropolis were of that character. Again, it seems hardly just to declare that Greek artists did not occupy themselves with landscape as such (131), in view of the fact that many frescoes from Pompeii depict landscapes, with only a subordinate figure or two, as for example the well-known scene on Mt. Ida, where the artist paints the country-side with its great trees and cliffs and rocks and flowing stream, and only incidentally introduces the small figure of the shepherd Paris (Hermann, *Denkmäler der Malerei*, Plate 8).

The chapter on science deals chiefly with physics